

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

---

ROBERT LEE ALLEN

\*

Plaintiff,

\*

v.

\*

2:07-CV-982-WKW  
(WO)

AUTAUGA COUNTY SHERIFF  
DEPT., *et al.*,

\*

\*

Defendants.

---

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action in which Plaintiff complains that Defendants subjected him to an unlawful and illegal arrest. Named as defendants are the Autauga County Sheriff's Department and Deputy B. Dillon.

Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that Plaintiff's claims against the Autauga County Sheriff's Department are due to be dismissed prior to service pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

**DISCUSSION**

The Autauga County Sheriff's Department is not a legal entity subject to suit or liability under § 1983. *Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that Plaintiff's claims for relief against this defendant are

subject to dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). *Id.*

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that:

1. Plaintiff's claims against the Autauga County Sheriff's Department be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i);

2. The Autauga County Sheriff's Department be DISMISSED as a party to this cause of action; and

3. This case, with respect to the claims against the remaining defendant, be referred back to the undersigned for appropriate proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that the parties are DIRECTED to file any objections to the said Recommendation on or before November 14, 2007. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by the District

Court of issues covered in the report and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the report accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) (*en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done, this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of November 2007.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr  
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE